UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/508,888	09/23/2004	Masayuki Adachi	5404/92	9842	
757 BRINKS HOF	7590 05/02/2007 ER GILSON & LIONE		EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 10395			PIZIALI, ANDREW T		
CHICAGO, IL 60610			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1771		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/02/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action					
Before	the	Filing	of an	Appeal	Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/508,888	ADACHI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Andrew T. Piziali	1771	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Andrew T. Piziali	1771			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 April 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to ore this application, applicant must timely file one of the foll places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a national representation (RCE) in compliant time periods:	owing replies: (1) an amendment, af Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in nce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forthe later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH 706.07(f).	ng date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN		
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, nay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in corfiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exa Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed. 	tension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since		
AMENDMENTS					
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection They raise new issues that would require further 			ecause		
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE be		TE Below),			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bappeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a		jected claims.			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1	.121. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).		
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s). 					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is p The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of		
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 2</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	but before or on the date of filing a N and sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necess	o overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appears ary and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).		
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explana REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	tion of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	ned.		
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered See Continuation Sheet.	but does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	nce because:		
 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s Other:). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine the references. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Ichibori does not appear to specifically mention co-weaving the compound yarn (A) with a different second yarn, but the applicant discloses that it is known in the art to use cellulosic fibers as a warp and a halogen-containing flame resistant fiber including antimony compounds as the weft yarn for interior design products, such as curtains and chair coverings, because special features of cellulosic fibers, such as natural feeling, hygroscopic property, and heat resistance, can be exhibited. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a woven fabric with cellulosic fibers as the warp and the halogen-containing flame resistant fibers of Ichibori as the weft, because the fabric could be used for interior design products such as curtains and chair coverings which would then possess natural feeling, hygroscopic property, and/or heat resistance.

The applicant asserts that it is unexpected that a union fabric comprising a compound yarn (A) composed of a halogen-containing flame resistant fiber (a-1) and a cotton or rayon fiber (a-2) would provide a high degree of flame resistance. The applicant pointed to Table 1 of the specification. Applicant's argument is without merit because applicant's argument is not commensurate in scope with the current claims. The current claims simply require "another fiber (a-2)." The features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the

claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

C77() 4/27/07

ANDREW PIZIALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER